

CONSTANTINE BROWN

Puzzling Foreign Policy of the U.S.

Roosevelt's Logic Cited, Take Strength Where You Find It and Demand Victory

ROME—The percentage of United States expenditure which goes toward deterring Communist aggression is enormous, encompassing everything from a large standing defense establishment to foreign aid and the Voice of America. Yet the policies which go along with this vast expenditure are, to some, downright puzzling.

If a country has a political goal directed against an enemy, the aim would logically be its attainment through victory. Our stupendous expenditures are made against communism. Yet we read from testimony taken by the Stennis subcommittee investigating the so-called muzzling of the military that the words "enemy," "victory," etc. have been deleted from speeches made by military men.

One can gather from snatches of information a possible explanation of our policy. In "CIA: The Inside Story," for instance, one comes across an enlightening passage. The author quotes former CIA Director Allen Dulles:

"We support our friends, he always said. Do you suggest that we support our enemies?"

Dulles' critics did not see things as quite so black and white. They complained that it was not enough for a foreign government or leader, said to be inimical to the Kremlin, that government also should be an advocate of the necessary social reforms that would buttress its country against Communist infiltration.

This is the clearest explanation of the United States foreign policy your reporter

has come across. It explains why he has read in his local American newspaper headlines: "United States May Cut Off Spain Aid Grants," and just below it: "JFK to Discuss Increase in Aid with Congo Leader." It explains United States hatred of the former Batista government in Cuba, the Trujillo government in the Dominican Republic, the Syngman Rhee government in South Korea and the Salazar government in Portugal, to name a few.

While the logic of the policy is understandable, there is no logic in continuing the policy after it has not only been proved on numerous occasions to be wholly unworkable but outright catastrophic to our defense posture.

In World War II President Roosevelt was not at all squeamish that our partner in the war against the Nazis was Soviet Russia, a dictatorship as bad but far more clever than the enemy's. He took an ally where he could find him. Our policy then was victory, and we had complete victory on the battlefields. But since the end of the war all our administrations have discarded the logical policies of President Roosevelt and turned thumbs down to any ally which does not have the "social reforms" our leaders believe they should have.

No one can sympathize with the methods of Batista in Cuba, but that island was one of the strongest bastions against our common enemy in that area. Not far away on another island we had another dedicated ally against Communist aggression, the Dominican Republic, a coun-

try without national debt, with no unemployment and militarily strong. Yet because these two governments did not have the social reforms we insist on, did not have our pattern of democracy—we encouraged and assisted new revolutionary governments. Until recently, those two governments were strong guardposts of the Caribbean. Today that area is in a precarious way.

In Europe, strongly anti-Communist Spain remains an important base for American air and naval forces. Yet it is no secret that the dictatorship of Franco is anathema to a number of our Government policy-makers. It is true, as the newspaper dispatch says, that Spain's economy has risen to stability since we aided the Franco government in exchange for American bases on Spanish land. And perhaps the argument that we can no longer afford to give that country foreign aid would have some logic if it were not announced in the same breath that we are considering aid to the Communist-infiltrated government of the Congo's Adoula or to outright Communist governments such as those of Ghana and Guinea.

Not by the widest stretch of imagination could it be said that Tito's government in Yugoslavia practices social reform. It is not against our policy to give aid to that country.

Logic and consistency seem to have no place in the policies emanating from Washington these days. Perhaps some of the Kennedy policy advisers are too young to remember the Roosevelt logic—take strength where you can find it, and demand nothing less than total victory.